DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 748 CE 044 848

AUTHOR	Solow, Katherine; Walker, Gary
TITLE	The Job Training Partnership Act: Service to Women.
INSTITUTION	Grinker Associates, Inc., New York, NY.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.; National Commission for Employment Policy (DOL), Washington, D.C.; Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Women's Bureau (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	86
NOTE	73p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Grinker Associates, 130 West 42nd Street, Suite 801, New York, NY 10036 ($10.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compliance (Legal); Displaced Homemakers; Early Parenthood; *Economically Disadvantaged; Employment Problems; Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Females; *Job Training; One Parent Family; Postsecondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Unemployment; Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Job Training Partnership Act 1982

ABSTRACT

This study describes and assesses the early years of implementation of Title II-A of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in regard to its services to women. Title II of JTPA is the major Federal program intervention--funded at about 1.8 billion dollars annually--aimed at providing employment and training services for the economically disadvantaged. For this study, data were gathered through the review of the records of a sample of 25 JTPA sites. The study found that the emphasis on high placement/low cost performance has generally operated as a disincentive to targeting services on particular groups of clients, particularly those that might require supportive services or a combination of training services. In addition, the severely reduced allocation of Federal resources to employment and training services over the past five years has lessened the inclination of program administrators to focus local JTPA programs on specific issues or groups of eligibles; thus, services for women specified in the legislation have not received high priority in the implementation. Specially tailored programming for women was limited to a very small percentage of training dollars. Hard-to-serve target groups such as displaced homemakers and teenaged parents were only very rarely offered special services. However, other research projects have shown that projects offered to women, especially to disadvantaged groups and welfare recipients, have been quite successful in raising women's earnings. Such programs should be used as examples in determining the future thrust of JTPA's programs for women. (KC)

ED273748

The Job Training Partnership Act

Service to Women

by
Katherine Solow

with
Gary Walker

Grinker, Walker & Associates
130 West 42nd Street, Suite 801
New York, New York 10036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J W Grinker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OE 044848

This report was prepared under grants from the Womens' Bureau of the Department of Labor, The Ford Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the National Commission for Employment Policy.

Mounting a national field assessment effort is a complicated process involving many individuals. First and foremost it would not be possible without the outstanding cooperation of those in the participating States and local Service Delivery Areas who were so generous with their time and whose perceptions and insights on the workings of JTPA form the basis of our own. Also crucial were the judgments of our field analysts who gathered the material and prepared individual site reports on the 25 Service Delivery Areas and 15 States visited for the study. In addition to the authors they include:

Thomas Bailey
Vince Cama
N. Wayne Daves
Ed Dement
Tom Faison
Hillary Feldstein
Ed Hester
Miriam Johnson
James R. Lott
Donald MacMaster
Ann Michael
Rita Reicher
Marilyn Sandorf
Sam Scott
R. C. Smith
Bonnie Snedeker
Miriam Snelling
Carl Spencer

Dr. Roy Feldman of Behavior Analysis, Inc. and Erika Bailey assisted in the analysis of the quantitative data. Mary Garvin assisted in the design of field instruments. We would also like to thank Mimi Grinker and Joan Woodbridge for their help in editing and preparing the manuscript.

The points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and not intended to represent the official position or policy of the supporting funding agencies.

Copyright 1986 Grinker, Walker and Associates

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....1

I. Introduction.....1

Women and JTPA.....1

Women and the Labor Market.....5

Study Methods and Site Selection.....8

II. Local Programming.....13

Enrollment and Participation.....13

Recruitment and Assignment.....17

Training.....20

Placement and Wages.....23

Special Issues for Women.....27

Non-Traditional Training.....27

Support Services.....34

The Ten Percent Window of Eligibility.....38

Special Training Programs for Women.....39

III. Oversight and Policy Development.....46

State Involvement.....49

Local Level Involvement.....56

IV. Conclusion.....60

Executive Summary

This study describes and assesses the early years of implementation of Title II-A of the Federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) vis-a-vis services to women. Title II-A of JTPA is the major federal program intervention--funded at about 1.8 billion dollars annually--aimed at providing employment and training services for the economically disadvantaged. The content and mix of actual JTPA services are shaped at the local level by a partnership of local government and a private volunteer group dominated by business representatives known as the Private Industry Council (PIC).

The Act declares that the key measures of its effectiveness are "... the increased employment and earnings of participants and the reductions in welfare dependency" (Sec. 105(a)). Those measures--JTPA's "bottom line"--reflect the key problems women face in the job market. First is the large gap between the average wage levels of working men and women; women's incomes have hovered at about 60 percent of men's for the last thirty years, in spite of enormous gains in female participation in the labor market and numerous small breakthroughs into higher wage industries and jobs dominated by men. Second is the fact that women account for a large majority of the welfare recipients in this country. Women constitute approximately 57 percent of economically disadvantaged

Americans. In the federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, over 90 percent of the adult recipients are women.

JTPA also has specific provisions which direct or encourage services to women. The Act mandates the development of programs to overcome occupational sex-stereotyping, directs that AFDC recipients be served in proportion to their share of the eligible population, allows for social service expenditures beyond the statutory limit for purposes such as day-care, and permits participation for a limited number (10 percent) of people who are not economically disadvantaged if they have special barriers to employment, such as " ... those who have limited English-language proficiency, or are displaced homemakers, school dropouts, teenage parents, handicapped, older workers, veterans, offenders, alcoholics, or addicts" (emphasis added). JTPA also requires "efforts to provide equitable service among substantial segments of the eligible population" (Sec. 141 (a)).

The sample for our study included 25 Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) in 15 states where in-depth field reviews were carried out and 32 additional SDAs in another 20 states where telephone interviews with key state and local officials were conducted primarily to verify field findings. We are confident that these sites are reasonably reflective of JTPA's performance as a whole. But from the

perspective of providing services to women, actual performance was mixed. In the aggregate women participated below their share of the total eligible group--50 percent of all training participants were women compared to a total eligible group of 55 percent women. Further participation of women in JTPA compared to their representation in the eligible population increased during the course of the study, particularly as procedures for referral of AFDC recipients to JTPA were worked out and became functional. Overall participation levels of women at most sites were a continuation of pre-JTPA experience, and did not change significantly with its introduction.

On the other hand, the high level of AFDC enrollments at most of the sites was an important success. This resulted primarily from a strong committment among major JTPA decision makers from all sectors and levels of government that welfare recipients should be a primary target of JTPA services. In addition, ADFC recipients had welfare derived income and support services, such as day-care, during their JTPA training. Because of reduced overall funding and statutory spending restrictions, most JTPA administrators committed very limited funds to such cost categories. Another developing source of commitment to AFDC programs was state involvement; during the period of our review three of the 15 states in the field study made substantial commitments of both JTPA and non-JTPA

funds to major statewide program initiatives to train and employ AFDC participants.

Other aspects of service to women mentioned in the Act--namely the development of programs which encourage non-traditional employment, and of programs aimed at special need groups such as teenage parents or displaced homemakers--did not fare as well, in terms of either widescale implementation or size of individual projects. Although one-third of the sites had contracts to provide non-traditional training to women, none of the contracts exceeded two percent of the SDAs' training budget. Special projects for teenage parents and displaced homemakers were even more limited.

This lack of direct action did not mean that women were excluded from, for example, a JTPA-supported training program which taught operation of excavation equipment. Rather, it meant that in most jurisdictions no efforts were made to counsel or encourage women toward non-traditional professions, nor were training programs designed to account for the special support needs of special groups.

Though less than one-fifth of the sites systematically collected and analyzed information regarding issues such as placement wage rates by gender, those that did showed substantially lower placement wage rates for women than for men. The only exceptions were when non-traditional placement wages were used for comparisons. In sites that

collected information on non-traditional placements, these accounted for about 10 percent of total job placements for women.

Support services of special importance to women, including day-care and vocational counseling, were low funding priorities at the majority of the SDAs. Those few jurisdictions that dedicated a greater share of available funds to these services had either previously organized task forces on women or on other high need groups, or were working within the framework of a larger state-initiated effort for AFDC recipients. Without such impetus and support, local SDAs were unlikely to undertake expenditures for services on any meaningful scale.

In sum, early JTPA implementation saw an equitable level of participation by women generally, and included a successful emphasis on enrolling AFDC participants, of whom over 90 percent are women. The Act's call for development of non-traditional training efforts, and treatment of high need groups like displaced homemakers and teenage parents, received substantial attention at only a few sites, as did the provision of support services such as day-care and vocational counseling. These latter efforts were beginning to receive more attention as JTPA implementation progressed. It may be that a greater dedication of JTPA resources to such efforts will be a natural part of the Act's evolution. However, state-level direction and

incentives were critical factors in influencing almost every local SDA that implemented such services and policies, and would appear to be a necessary part of a widespread increase in the use of JTPA for services tailored to the needs of women.

I. INTRODUCTION

This study was sponsored by the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor to assess the implementation of the federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) from the perspective of service to women. The focus of the assessment is on Title II-A of the Act which deals with the employment and training needs of the economically disadvantaged.[1] While girls and women benefit from other portions of the Act--the summer youth employment program (Title II-B), the dislocated workers programs (Title III), and the programs for special populations (Title IV)--Title II-A has particular importance to women since they represent the majority of those living in poverty.

Women and JTPA

In October of 1982 the President signed into law the Job Training Partnership Act to become operational October 1, 1983. The Act has five major sections: Title I, establishing JTPA's purpose, institutional framework and programmatic rules; Title II, regarding training services for the economically disadvantaged (II-A) and the summer youth program (II-B); Title III, establishing assistance

---

[1] Includes a) those with income less than the Office of Management and Budget's poverty level or 70 percent of the lower living standard income level, whichever is higher; b) federal, state, or local welfare recipients; c) food stamp recipients; d) foster children for whom state or local payments are made; and e) handicapped individuals who are economically disadvantaged but whose families are not, as permitted by the Secretary of Labor.

for dislocated workers; Title IV, regarding federally administered programs (Native Americans, migrant workers, veterans, Job Corps and other special activities); and Title V, which contains miscellaneous provisions including amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act.

JTPA changes federal, state and local government roles from prior employment and training legislation. The federal role is reduced, and many administrative and oversight functions formerly carried out by the federal government are assigned to the states. A major justification for the assignment of more authority and responsibility to the states was to place administration and oversight of JTPA nearer the locus of the problems being addressed, on the assumption that this would increase the likelihood of efficient and coordinated use of resources.

Another important change under JTPA is the increased role given to the private for-profit sector at both the state and local levels. One-third of the membership of the State Job Training Coordinating Councils--the state-level bodies selected by the governors to guide and review the performance of JTPA--must be from the private sector. At the local level, Private Industry Councils (PICs)--whose membership is selected by local elected officials--are accorded a partnership status with local government in

carryjng out JTPA. At least 51 percent of a PIC's members, including its chair, must be from the private for-profit sector. This partnership amounts to a sharing of local authority, whereas prior to JTPA, under CETA, such authority typically resided solely in local government.

The influence of these structural changes on employment and training programming with regard to women was an important area of focus for this study.

As noted earlier, Title II-A of the Job Training Partnership Act is of particular importance in meeting the employment needs of women because of its focus on the economically disadvantaged, the majority of whom are women. In addition, the Act itself contains a number of directives and references that indicate strong commitment to meeting the employment and training needs of poor women. For example, one of the fundamental goals of Title II-A is to reduce welfare rolls: the Act states that JTPA is "an investment in human capital," and the desired return on that investment is to be measured in "the increased employment and earnings of participants, and the reductions in welfare dependency" (Title I, Sec. 106(a)), (emphasis added). Women (and their dependents) are the primary recipients of welfare; over 90 percent of the adult recipients of the federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program are women. The Act mandates that AFDC recipients must be served in proportion to their share

of the eligible population.

In addition, the Act states that its services are to be provided on an equitable basis among "substantial segments of the eligible population" (Title I, Sec. 141(a)). As noted earlier, the majority of the eligibles are women. The Act includes the conventional prohibitions against discrimination, including discrimination on the basis of sex under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

The Act also requires that local JTPA programs develop non-traditional employment, an issue of special importance to women. The Act states that "[e]fforts shall be made to develop programs which contribute to occupational development, upward mobility, development of new careers, and overcoming sex-stereotyping in occupations traditional for the other sex" (Title I, Sec. 141(d) (2)).

Women also have a special interest in the provision of support services, particularly day-care services, while they are attending employment and training programs. The Act acknowledges this special interest; it allows a local PIC to seek permission from the state to exceed the Act's budget limitiations on support services[1] under several limited circumstances, including if the local JTPA program

---

[1]The Act mandates that administrative and support services together not exceed 30 percent of an SDA's allocation. Administrative costs may not exceed 15 percent.

plans to spend more than 50 percent of its support services budget on day-care services.

The Act also promotes the use of its services for specified sub-groups of eligibles that have difficulty securing and maintaining decent-paying jobs. The states are provided a three percent setaside for those 55 and older; women account for a disproportionate share of the elderly poor. High school dropouts are to be served "equitably," that is, according to their share of the eligible population; the poverty rates for young women with low educational achievement are much higher than those for men. The Act allows ten percent of enrollees to have incomes above the poverty level if they have serious barriers to employment, and mentions, among others, teenage parents and displaced homemakers.

In sum, the JTPA legislation emphasizes in numerous ways, through goals, mandates, targeting, and budgetary flexibility, the importance of employment and training programs for economically disadvantaged women. The degree to which and ways in which the implementation of the Act meets those various directives and emphases are a major focus of this study.

Women and the Labor Market

Prior to World War II, changes in the female work force were gradual. Since then, changes in the work habits of American women have been relatively rapid. Improved health

care and the lowering of infant mortality rates have shortened the number of years that women spend achieving desired family size. The reduction in the size of families, the postponement of marriage, and advances in technology have reduced the time required to maintain a household. Greater life expectancy has also increased the number of productive years experienced by women after childbearing while the rapid rise in the number of female-headed households has resulted in an increased need for income among women.

Movement into the labor force has also been supported by a number of changes in the economy. The growth in the service industries increased the demand in traditionally female occupations, particularly in the clerical and health care fields. Greater opportunities for part-time and part-year employment have been an additional inducement for many women. Lastly, and both a cause and effect of changes in women's employment patterns, the social acceptance of working women has supported the entrance of women into the labor force.

As a result of these developments, the labor force participation rates of women have increased dramatically. Since 1947, the number of women in the labor force has tripled. Approximately one-third of women were in the labor force in the immediate post-war years, compared to over half today. In comparison, the labor force

participation rate of men has declined slightly.

Despite the progress achieved by women in finding work, they continue to face obstacles. For example, the wage gap between men and women has remained relatively constant over the last 25 years, with women's earnings hovering around 60 percent that of men. Discrimination has played a role in this, though it is difficult to quantify. Beyond direct discrimination, other factors have also played a role in the lower economic and employment achievements of women relative to men. Foremost among these is occupational stereotyping that concentrates women in low-paying jobs with limited opportunities for training and advancement. Employment for women has been concentrated in a narrow occupational range: 35% of women workers are in clerical occupations and 19% are classified as service workers. While a number of laws, such as the Equal Pay Act and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, have helped women, their progress in breaking down occupational stereotypes has been limited. For example, while the number of women carpenters increased by 300 percent between 1972 and 1981, their actual share of the occupation rose from one percent to two percent.

According to the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, "despite the efforts being made by women to enlarge their occupational horizons and the development of programs to encourage these efforts, occupational and industrial

segregation remains the single most important problem facing women workers today because it is closely tied to their low earnings."

Thus, the position of women in the labor market can be summarized as progress in the face of adversity. Women represent a growing proportion of the labor force. They have been making small gains in many traditionally male occupations which offer access to the primary labor market. Nonetheless, a high percentage of women are in need of employment and training assistance. Title II-A of the federal Job Training Partnership Act has two basic eligibility criteria--welfare receipt, or earned income below the federally established poverty line--and women represent a majority of Americans in both these categories.

Study Methods and Site Selection

Several approaches to data collection were used in this study, including: (1) collection of statistical data regarding client and service characteristics in 25 service delivery areas (SDAs) in 15 states; (2) comparative case studies based on field work in those 25 SDAs; (3) telephone interviews with key JTPA officials in a separate group of 32 SDAs (See Tables I-A and I-B).

The field work, carried out in 25 SDAs, provided the bulk of information for the study. Field instruments were developed for use by field analysts experienced in interviewing, collecting statistical information and

writing reports. Field analysts were typically assigned at least two SDAs in order to give them firsthand experience with varying approaches to the implementation of JTPA.

TABLE I-A
Characteristics of Field Study SDAs*

SDA	MAJOR CITIES	SDA POPULATION	% ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED
SIXCO (Arizona)		318,755*	21.8
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY (California)		665,300	10.5
SAN DIEGO CONSORTIUM (California)	SAN DIEGO	1,861,846	19.1
SOUTH BAY (California)		339,783	16.5
DENVER COUNTY (Colorado)	DENVER	492,365	13.4
LARIMER COUNTY (Colorado)		159,022	9.9
LEON-GADSDEN-JEFFERSON-WAKULLA (Florida)		226,300	23.7
TAMPA (Florida)	TAMPA	285,700	23.4
SDA II (Kansas)	TOPEKA	483,758	16.2
CHICAGO (Illinois)	CHICAGO	3,005,072	20.3*
LAND OF LINCOLN (Illinois)	SPRINGFIELD	210,000	9.3
NORTH METRO (Massachusetts)	CAMBRIDGE	725,993	15.3
DETROIT (Michigan)	DETROIT	922,035	27.4
GENESEE/SHIAWASSEE (Michigan)	FLINT	521,589	10.0*
GULF COAST (Mississippi)		182,202	21.4
BUFFALO-CHEEKTOWAGA-TONAWANDA (New York)	BUFFALO	558,581	21.5
NEW YORK CITY (New York)	NEW YORK	7,071,639	19.0
WESTCHESTER COUNTY (New York)		671,248	10.1
SUSQUEHANNA (Pennsylvania)		513,736	8.0*
RICHLAND COUNTY (South Carolina)		269,572	15.3
HOUSTON (Texas)	HOUSTON	1,750,000	12.5
RURAL CAPITAL AREA (Texas)		227,890	15.4
VERMONT (Vermont)		539,091	13.0
SEATTLE/KING COUNTY (Washington)	SEATTLE	1,320,000	7.0
SPOKANE (Washington)	SPOKANE	353,000	——

*Numbers are taken from SDA training plans unless marked with an *, in which case they are 1980 Census figures.

TABLE I-B
Telephone Survey SDAs

Alaska (Statewide)
North East Arkansas
South West Arkansas
Greenlee County, Arizona
Golden Sierra SDA, California
Riverside County, California
Bridgeport-Norwalk-Stamford Valley, Connecticut
South West Florida
Metro Atlanta, Georgia
South East Idaho
Kankakee Valley, Indiana
Cherokee, Iowa
Blue Grass, Kentucky
Ouachita Parish, Louisiana
Upper Short, Maryland
Region 7B, Michigan
West Metro, Minnesota
Camdenton, Missouri
Southern Nevada, Nevada
Burlington County, New Jersey
Sullivan County, New York
Centralina, North Carolina
Mahoning-Columbiana, Ohio
South East Ohio, Monroe, Ohio
Central Oklahoma, Oklahoma
Eugene, Oregon
Beaver County, Pennsylvania
Jackson, Tennessee
Brazos Valley SDA, Texas
Bear River District, Utah
Greater Peninsula, Virginia
South East Wisconsin

The emphasis on field work as the vehicle for data collection and analysis is a result of several factors. Within the overall modest resources available for this effort, it is a more reliable way to assess the kind of complex issues on which this study is focused. Also, the information requirements and systems of the federal government and the states have undergone significant modification in the transition from the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) to JTPA. The minimal federal requirements in reporting on JTPA have resulted in less uniform information than under CETA. Though the states in most instances require more information from the local JTPA programs than does the federal government, state data requirements and definitions are not uniform and therefore rarely comparable. A typical example occurred in tracking service to the welfare population: some SDAs collect information on the Work Incentive Program (WIN)-mandatory AFDC recipients, others collect information on all AFDC recipients, and still others include those receiving state assistance and Supplementary Security Income. The process of shifting from a federally established information system to state-developed systems is incomplete in some states, and information could not be accessed. Thus the focus of the study was on observation and interviews at the local level.

At the outset of JTPA, there were 596 service delivery

areas in the nation. As indicated above, 57 SDAs were chosen for examination in this study. Two different selection strategies were employed in selecting those SDAs.

The field study sample of 25 SDAs was chosen to be generally representative of the nation's SDAs on several basic criteria. Criteria used for sample selection were geographic distribution, ethnic diversity, unemployment rate, and urban/rural/suburban configuration. The sample is purposive in that it overrepresents SDAs with larger populations in order that the study findings better reflect the use of JTPA resources, and not simply the manner in which JTPA jurisdictions have formed. Thus, the 25 field sites represent four percent of the nation's SDAs who receive 12 percent of total JTPA funding.

The 32 SDAs in the telephone survey were chosen to complement the 25 selected for field work. Thus they include a higher proportion of sites that are rural or rural/suburban, as well as a higher proportion of areas that are newly-defined in that they do not conform to previous CETA jurisdictions.

II. LOCAL PROGRAMMING

This chapter utilizes two approaches to assess JTPA's performance relative to women. The first is to describe the basic features of local JTPA program implementation--recruitment, enrollment, assignment, available training and support services, placement strategy--and assess their usefulness to the employment and training needs of poor women. The second approach is to look at implementation practices of special interest to women such as non-traditional training, support services including day-care, and training programs for some of the target groups mentioned in the Act: AFDC recipients, teenage parents, and displaced homemakers. The combination of these two approaches provides a thorough review of the implementation of JTPA with respect to women.

A. Enrollment and Participation

The enactment of JTPA does not appear to have had a significant impact on the participation rates of women in federal employment and training programs. None of the SDAs in the study reported a significant reduction in the rate of participation of women under JTPA compared to its predecessor CETA, and a few reported increases.

The data from the field sites indicates that women are being planned for and served slightly below their proportion of the JTPA-eligible population. Women accounted for 55 percent of the aggregate eligible

population at the study field sites, according to the training plans published in all SDAs. Service goals set by the SDAs lagged slightly behind at 52 percent. This pattern is also reflected by the Department of Labor in the quick turnaround data from the Job Training Longitudinal Survey. According to that study 56% of the eligibles, 50% of the transition year enrollees and 52% of the Program Year 1984 enrollees were women. As Table II-A below indicates, 40 percent of the sites established quantitative goals regarding Title II-A service levels to women in Transition Year 1984 (TY 84) which met or exceeded the proportion of women in the local eligible population. Another 35 percent of the sites were within five percentage points of setting service goals for women proportionate to their actual share of eligibles. Thus, 75 percent of the study sites were substantially in accord with or exceeded the statute's mandate of equitable service to "substantial segments" of the elibible population, at least in terms of their stated plans for TY 84. A quarter of the study sites set goals for service to women which were less than 95 percent of the equitable service mandate; of those, none was below 89 percent and the majority were in the 92-94 percent range.

The actual enrollment levels of women fell further short of equalling the proportion of women in the eligible population for the transition year. Only 23 percent of the

TABLE II-A
Goals and Actual Service Levels for Women
in Proportion to Their Share of the Eligible Population

(Percentages of Sites)

	Met/Exceeded Proportionate Level	Attained >95% Proportionate Level	Attained <95% Proportionate Level
TY 84 goals for service to women	40%	35%	25%
TY 84 actual service to women	23	8	69
PY 84 goals for service to women	25	33	42
PY 84 actual service to women	42	33	25

field sites met or exceeded the equitable service level for women in the eligible population; an additional eight percent served at least 95 percent of their equitable service goal. Almost 70 percent of the sites fell significantly short of serving proportionate levels of women.

The enrollment levels for PY 84, which runs from July 1984 through June 1985, underwent interesting changes; as Table II-A indicates, the service goals for women dropped in relation to their proportion of the eligible population, but actual service improved. Only a quarter of the sites planned to meet or exceed the proportion of women in the

eligible population. However, 42 percent achieved actual service levels that met or exceeded their equitable service standard. Only a quarter of the sites failed to reach at least 95 percent of the equitable service standard in PY 84, a significant decline from the almost 70 percent of the earlier period.

The primary factors affecting the enrollment of women were close coordination with the local AFDC welfare program and the types of training offered. Those SDAs with a high proportionate enrollment of women often had a close referral arrangement with welfare. For example, the Tallahassee, Florida SDA, which reported the highest enrollment levels for both AFDC recipients (48%) and women (74%), located JTPA on the same premises as the local AFDC office. The extremely high levels of female participants in Tallahassee appeared to be due not only to the coordination with welfare but to the types of services provided.

The enrollment level of women is also correlated to the percentage of participants enrolled in classroom training. Both CETA and its predecessor, the Manpower Development and Training Act, as well as JTPA, proportionately over-enrolled white, male high school graduates in on-the-job training programs and proportionately over-enrolled women in classroom training programs. Local SDAs emphasizing classroom training also tended to be those

who substantially met or exceeded their equitable service level standards.

JTPA reinforces this traditional distribution of services by eliminating the provision of stipends for participants in classroom training programs. Because women were more likely to be receiving AFDC, they were better able to afford participation in classroom training. Thus it was not surprising that those SDAs that devoted a large portion of their training slots to classroom training attracted a high percentage of women.

The difference in type of programming provided is the reason for the striking difference in actual service levels between TY 84 and PY 84. TY 84 was JTPA's initial operating period and lasted only nine months. Classroom training programs tended to take longer to start up, and were longer in duration than other types of training, and thus fewer women were served. By PY 84 (which was a full 12 months), the local JTPA programs were at full operating capacity, and enrollment numbers thus reflected greater participation by women.

B. Recruitment and Assignment

The recruitment and assignment of participants into specific training activities has become less centralized under JTPA than it was under CETA. Training providers themselves are increasingly likely to be responsible for their own outreach and screening of participants. This

change is primarily a result of reduced central administrative budgets under JTPA. The most feasible way for most SDAs to reduce central costs was to decentralize functions. Under a technique called performance-based contracting, service providers' costs could all be lumped under the category of "training" with no charge to "administration." In addition, training providers responded to JTPA's strict performance standards on cost and placement rate by demanding greater control over who entered their programs.

According to several local officials, this decentralization has worked against the best interests of women, since they, in particular, benefit from a thorough pre-enrollment counseling process that explores a variety of employment options. Without that process, most women tend to self-select the clerical and service occupations in which women predominate. While it is not surprising that women will make these traditional selections for which they have an abundance of role models, it is not necessarily in their best financial interest. As will be discussed below, non-traditional training and placements often yield better wages. Counseling encourages women to consider issues such as possible career paths and their long-term earning potential which are crucial to reducing welfare dependency and closing the wage gap for women. This type of vocational counseling has been reduced as a result of budgetary

limitations.

Very few of the study sample sites provided employment counseling intended to encourage women to consider a broad range of occupations before selecting a particular training program. Only two SDAs among the 25 in the field sample reported a policy of encouraging non-traditional assignments through pre-enrollment counseling. In Contra Costa, California, this practice reflected a strong SDA interest in programming for women. The other SDA, located in Kansas, had incentives from the State to serve increased numbers of women, and to achieve increases in wage rates for participants over previous wage rates they had had. However, Kansas was one of the only three states among the 15 states in the field sample that provided incentives for local JTPA programs to actually achieve that goal. Women also dominated the local elected official board at this SDA (three of four members) and represented one-third of the membership of the PIC.

Many of the remaining SDAs and service providers offered career counseling as part of the intake process, but non-traditional training was not emphasized. Such counseling was often very brief. One site reported that the intake process had been reduced from a full day to as little as 20 minutes. The sentiment expressed by the Vice Chair of one PIC was echoed at the majority of sites, "[t]he only way a women is going to receive non-traditional

training at this SDA is if she walks in and says she wants to be a truck driver."

C. Training

The distribution of types of training under JTPA is highly correlated to gender at the nine SDAs that kept information on training provided to women. For these sites, 44 percent of all participants received classroom training, and the majority of those (65%) were women. On-the-job training (OJT) was provided to 18 percent of the participants, of which 39 percent were women. At the remaining SDAs anecdotal information reflected similar distributions.

The Job Training Longitudinal Survey (JTLS) reports a slightly different mix of services and distributions by gender. In the JTLS sample, 40% of the participants were initially assigned to classroom training of which 62% were women and 22 percent of participants were initially assigned to OJT of which 41% were women. The differences between the two distributions are modest, and those that are evident can be accounted for by the fact that the sample for this study was intentionally weighted towards large urban areas.

Despite the strong links between client characteristics and the types of services provided, as well as the correlation between types of training and enrollment levels discussed earlier, none of the sites reported that the mix

of services was driven by targetting decisions. Rather the program mix at a given site was determined by the proposals received from service providers and labor market information. Another major factor in program mix was simply local history. While at the federal and state levels JTPA is very much a new act, locally it is a continuation of earlier services. Three-quarters of the service providers under JTPA were also service providers under CETA. Local programs were not redesigned from the ground up with the enactment of JTPA but evolved out of the earlier service distributions.

The concentration of women in classroom training and their limited access to or selection of on-the-job training is, as was noted earlier, a continuation of the practices of previous federal employment and training programs. The practice may derive in part from the fact that traditionally male occupations already made great use of apprenticeships and on-the-job training. Clerical and health care occupations (i.e. clerk/typist, word processor, data entry clerk, home health aide and nurse assistant) were more easily adapted to classroom training. In any event, the distribution has been reinforced under JTPA by the elimination of stipends. Men are less likely to have the supplementary income to allow them to invest 12-16 weeks in classroom training.

On-the-job training is in some respects more desirable

than classroom training, not only because it provides an immediate source of income for the period of training, but also because it offers a better chance for permanent employment. Placement rates are typically higher for those trained on the job than in the classroom, and JTPA is no exception. Moreover, placements following OJT are usually at the higher end of the wage scale for employment and training programs. These higher wages in on-the-job training are a further result of the concentration in traditionally male occupations.

None of the states reported that the distribution of training services by gender was a policy concern. In fact, the Act specifically discouraged states from becoming overly involved in local decisions regarding programming. One SDA did report that pressure was being placed by the SDA on the sub-contractors providing on-the-job training to enroll more women by including language in the contracts which required them to enroll 50 percent female participants. However, the SDA staff and the service providers were equally aware that the SDA would not enforce this clause with any serious action, such as deobligation of funds. It was intended more as a statement of intention. The SDA was anticipating some improvement in the enrollment levels of women in on-the-job training, but not a dramatic turn around.

D. Placement and Wages

JTPA is a performance-driven program. SDAs are required to meet the seven federally-established

TABLE II-B
Federal Performance Standards
and PY 84 Field Site Performance

	Federal Performance Standards	% of Study Sites that Met/ Exceeded Goal
1. Adult Entered Employment Rate*	58%	94%
2. Adult Cost per Entered Employment	$5,900	90%
3. Adult Average Wage at Placement	$4.90	81%
4. Welfare Entered Employment Rate	41%	100%
5. Youth Entered Employment Rate	41%	100%
6. Youth Positive Termination Rate**	82%	44%
7. Youth Cost per Positive Termination	$4,900	95%

* The definition of "entered employment" under JTPA is placement in an unsubsidized job.
**A positive termination for youth includes enrollment into further education or training, entrance into the armed forces, or the achievement of specific "competencies" or benchmarks (usually educational, job-seeking, or occupational skills) approved by the PICs.

performance standards shown below. Failure to meet them for a two-year period is, according to the Act, to trigger some form of serious state intervention, which could involve the selection of a new jurisdiction and entities to administer the local program.

As Table II-B indicates, JTPA has generally been highly successful in meeting the cost (#2 and #7) and entered employment (#1, #4 and #5) standards. About four out of five sites met wage placement rate standards (#3). Less than half (44%) were able to achieve the performance standard rates for youth positive termination.

One standard of particular interest to women is the "Welfare Entered Employment Rate" standard. The federal goal of 41 percent of welfare recipients placed into jobs at the end of their JTPA training was met or exceeded by all 25 of the field sites. It is a reasonable assumption that this high level of performance implies a high placement rate for women AFDC recipients, though that cannot be known with certainty since the data on welfare placements includes no breakdown between women (who dominate the welfare program with federal funding) and men (who dominate the exclusively state and locally-funded welfare programs).

Beyond the above information on performance standards required by the federal government, there is little systematic information collected or reported about the

performance of JTPA. Although a limited number of states have implemented systems to measure job retention, no national data is available. Very few states required information regarding increases in wages from previous rates for JTPA participants placed on jobs.

Only four of the 25 field study SDAs provided placement rates and wages by gender. At all of these sites, as Table II-C below indicates, women lagged behind men both in entered employment rates and average wage rates. Not only is the sample extremely limited but without supporting measurements of job-readiness or previous wage rates by gender, it is not possible to assess the performance of women under JTPA either compared to men or to their previous status. It may be that women placed under JTPA have, before entry into a JTPA program, lower educational levels, less work experience, and lower previous wage rates than men, and that JTPA's actual impact on the employment and income of women is equal to or greater than the impact it has on men. Neither the federal nor state governments have required the collection of such data.

The limited data provided is in keeping with figures provided by the Job Training Longitudinal Survey. The Survey indicated an overall entered employment rate of 64% and average wage of $4.61. The entered employment rate for men was 67% and their average wage at placement was $4.87.

TABLE II-C
JTPA Performance Measures by Gender

	Female Entered Employm't Rate	Male Entered Employm't Rate	Female Avg. Wage	Male Avg. Wage
SDA 1	83%	85%	$4.81	$5.25
SDA 2	68	76	3.99	4.42
SDA 3	51	63	4.50	4.97
SDA 4	47	53	3.97	5.16

The limited data available from the sample sites appears to be typical of local performance.

In sum, general JTPA programming has had reasonable participation levels of women compared both to previous federal programs and to women's respresentation among JTPA eligibles. To a large degree the participation levels are due to the special emphasis and attractiveness of the program to AFDC recipients. It is by and large not related to any other special emphasis on the needs of women for distinct service approaches.

JTPA has not affected the traditional distribution of women as the majority of classroom training enrollees, and men as the majority of on-the-job training enrollees. If anything, the lack of stipends for classroom training has strengthened that dichotomy. Based on the limited data available, it appears that the traditional differentials between men and women in the placement and wage rates achieved by federal training programs have not been

lessened.

Perhaps the JTPA program's greatest general weakness regarding the analysis of its impact on women has been its lack of systematic data collection requirements. Current data requirements, both state and federal, are so minimal that is is difficult to make any reasoned judgments about the impact of JTPA on women, and thus difficult for policy makers and managers to assess the program's cost efficiency, or need for change.

E. Special Issues for Women

This section will review the implementation of certain aspects of the Act that are of special concern to women. It will also review the service to sub-groups within the female population that are in special need of employment and training assistance. As discussed in the first chapter of this report, JTPA specifically mentions a number of issues especially relevant to women including support services, non-traditional training, and the use of the 10 percent window of eligibility. The Act also stresses the importance of serving welfare recipients, displaced homemakers, teenage parents, and the elderly.

1. Non-Traditional Training

None of the states in the study reported that non-traditional training was a major policy goal. Of the 25 SDAs in this study, in only one, Contra Costa, California, were non-traditional placements a priority

policy concern. This focus on women's issues was established under CETA. The concern was manifested by an advisory committee to the Private Industry Council which reviewed the SDAs plans to meet the needs of women. The SDA had been active in lobbying at the state level for a statewide mandate on non-traditional training. While they were successful in raising the issue, the legislation that was ultimately passed carried no incentives or sanctions to encourage compliance.

There are two basic approaches available to SDAs to achieve increased placements of women in non-traditional occupations; women can be encouraged to participate in regular training programs that are offered in traditionally male occupations, or programs can be offered specifically to train women in non-traditional fields. Contra Costa took the former approach. While there were no special contracts to provide non-traditional training for women, the SDA had a policy to direct women into regular training programs for traditionally male occupations. A special effort was developed to involve women, particularly displaced homemakers, in small business development. This program represented a sharp departure from most training for women and, while not necessarily targeted on non-traditional occupations, it was designed to encourage women to take on the non-traditional role of entrepreneur. One other SDA, Spokane, Washington, indicated that service

to women had been a major criterion in selecting a service provider in the construction trades.

Nearly one-third of the sites offered some non-traditional training through special contracts. The programs were all small and none of the sites spent more than two percent of the training budget on non-traditional training contracts. The most popular occupations for non-traditional occupational training were the apprenticeship trades and cable installation. The great majority of these programs were run by non-profit organizations whose mission was to serve women. In addition to these occupationally specific non-traditional training programs, one women's organization providing job search assistance had a cycle devoted to non-traditional jobs. It is interesting to note, however, that other women's organizations offered non-traditional training with non-JTPA funds and traditional training under JTPA contracts because the budgetary and performance requirements of JTPA were ill-suited to non-traditional training. The restrictions on support services were most frequently noted as disincentives for undertaking non-traditional training under JTPA. The performance standards were also viewed as discouraging more innovative training efforts.

The occupational distribution of placements under JTPA is also very traditional. Moreover, it underscores the

link between typically male occupations and high wage rates. At the nine SDAs in the field study sample for which occupational information was available by gender, placements in clerical and service industries accounted for the majority of the placements for women. At two sites, clerical and health care alone represented 90 percent of placements. At five sites these occupational categories represented between 50 percent and 90 percent of placements for women. Lastly, two sites reported that less than a third of the women were placed in these two occupational areas. The two sites at the low end of the scale were Vermont, whose rural economy has far fewer openings in clerical occupations, and Denver, where there was a high reliance on electronic assembly positions for both women and men. Thus the occupational distribution for women under JTPA appears to be at least as, if not more, narrowly focused than the general labor market.

Many factors play a role in this concentration of women in a few occupations. Service occupations, particularly health care, have been expanding recently, creating a need for entry level workers. Placements are therefore relatively easy. The concentration of women in clerical and health care occupations is also a result of training patterns at the local level. Our field work revealed that there was a widespread tendency among SDAs to use class-size contracts in clerical and health care

occupations, and to rely more on individual referrals for traditionally male occupations. Under class-size contracts, there is a financial incentive to ensure that the classes are full in order to lower cost per placement measures. Service providers, and SDAs that are responsible for enrollment and assignment, were therefore more likely to present women with the option of enrollling in classes in a few traditional occupations, while men were more likely to be offered an individual referral to a vocational school or community college and encouraged to select from a variety of courses. Even without the tendency of contractors to channel women into classroom training in traditional occupations, the women themselves tend to select these programs unless encouraged otherwise. In addition, those SDAs which are increasing on-the-job training and reducing classroom training, a trend noted under JTPA, appear to be further concentrating their remaining classroom training in traditionally female occupations.

A recent study sponsored by the Departments of Labor and Education and by the Carnegie Corporation entitled "Women's Work, Men's Work: Sex Segregation on the Job" estimated that 35-40 percent of the wage gap across all levels of the economy is attributable to sex segregation among occupations. There were no estimates offered as to the size of the wage gap for entry level workers. However,

men clearly out-earned women in JTPA. At the four SDAs noted earlier that tracked wage at placement by gender, the wage gap ranged from $.34 to $1.19 per hour. The smallest difference was reported by Cambridge, Massachusetts which has a very tight labor market and the largest by Land of Lincoln (Springfield area), Illinois, which is suffering from high unemployment and plant closings.

It is interesting to note that the SDAs which tracked wage rates by sex were not among those that reported the greatest interest in non-traditional training. Two of the sites where data was provided were "high tech" centers with sophisticated management information systems that could be readily accessed. In another instance the availability of the data resulted from the small size of the program and the willingness of the SDA staff to review placements person-by-person for the purpose of this report. The remaining site was a single SDA state that relied heavily on the Job Service to place participants, and therefore, had a well-established data collection system in place. All other sample SDAs either did not collect the information, could not generate it in a readily usable form, had information system problems, or were unable to undertake the special computer runs necessary to do so.

The information provided offers a strong reinforcement of the value of non-traditional placements for women, as indicated in Table II-D. The percentages of

non-traditional placements are estimates based on job titles.

As Table II-D indicates, women benefitted greatly from placement in non-traditional occupations, exceeding the average wage rate for men in two of the four sites. The only site at which non-traditional placements did not dramatically alter the wage gap was Site 3. This can be accounted for by a high number of placements in stock clerk, janitorial and similar low wage, traditionally male positions. Site 2 had the lowest level of non-traditional placements due to a severely depressed local economy that has brought dislocated workers into Title II-A programs.

TABLE II-D

JTPA Wage Rates by Sex and Non-Traditional Occupations

SITE	All Men Avg WAGE	All Women Avg WAGE	Non-Trad Women Avg Wage	% Non-Trad Placements
1	$5.73	$5.39	$6.61	10%
2.	5.16	3.97	5.42	3
3.	5.18	4.53	4.64	9
4.	4.68	3.96	4.64	19

Women were unable to compete successfully for the more desirable jobs given the high skill levels of male participants. The high level of non-traditional placements at Site 4 can, in good part, be attributed to the fact that

as a rural SDA there were fewer available placements in clerical positions. The wage rates between women in non-traditional occupations and men were nearly identical.

2. Support Services

Support services as defined by JTPA include "transportation, health care, special services and materials for the handicapped, child care, meals, temporary shelter, financial counseling, and other reasonable expenses required for participation in the training program" (Definitions, Sec. 4 (24)). While many men make use of support services, the need is particularly strong among certain sub-groups of the female population. Day-care, in particular, is primarily used by women. Certain counseling services are very important for displaced homemakers and other women with either low self-esteem or little knowledge of the labor market.

Two different aspects of JTPA act as disincentives to the provision of substantial levels of support services. These are, first, the aggregate spending limits on administrative and support service budgets, and second, the performance standards. JTPA set a 15 percent ceiling on administrative expenditures and a 30 percent combined ceiling on administrative and support service expenditures. For practical purposes this translated into less than 15 percent for support services, since the study

sites averaged 17 percent for administrative expenses. While the Act permits local PICs to request a waiver of the 15 percent limit on support services if they target special populations in need of greater services, or if the cost of day-care is excessive, none of the SDAs in the field sample elected to do so. The performance standards discouraged SDAs from taking advantage of the waiver option because the cost standards include the administrative and support service budgets. Thus an SDA can improve its cost per placement standards by dedicating more than 70% of its total budget to training. Applying for a waiver would make it more difficult to meet the performance goal. Therefore, local interest in providing support services that might encourage enrollment of these eligibles was minimal.

There was a wide variation in delivery systems for support services. Some SDAs contracted out support services to a particular non-profit agency and referred those participants in need to that agency. When the agency had used up its contract budget, no more support services were available. Other SDAs offered only transportation and needs-based payments and expected outside service deliverers to provide whatever additional services were deemed necessary out of their own budgets. One SDA provided whatever services were needed, as judged by central staff on a case-by-case basis.

Only a few states required any reports regarding the

kinds of support services provided. Therefore, information detailing the precise support services offered at each site was scanty. Nonetheless, 15 sites were able to produce some information. According to these SDAs needs-based payments and transportation were the most common services provided. None of the sample SDAs indicated that counseling beyond an initial screening process was provided on a regular basis, although some individual service providers included on-going counseling.

Of those support services offered, day-care is most strongly linked to services to women. Spending on day-care services under JTPA has been very low, according to the limited data available. While only seven of the 25 field sites provided data on spending levels for day-care, the reported levels were uniformly low. Three out of the seven sites provided no day-care services out of JTPA funds. Expenditures at the other four sites ranged from 0.2 percent to 4 percent of the total Title II-A budget. The average for the seven sites was less than one percent. Interviews at the remaining field study sites provided no indication that the level of day-care services offered was substantially greater than that provided at the seven reporting sites.

However, this low level of day-care services only reflects JTPA expenditures. Day-care services were also available to some degree through local welfare offices to

those JTPA participants receiving public assistance. The level of welfare dollars being spent on day-care services for JTPA clients is not known, but is clearly greater than that spent by the JTPA program itself.

Thus, it is simply not known with any accuracy to what degree, if any, JTPA's low expenditures on day-care services hindered the participation of women in JTPA. There was concern expressed by some SDAs about the availability of day-care services. In Chicago, for example, the SDA provided no day-care although AFDC recipients could receive services through the Department of Public Welfare. According to SDA staff, the support service budget was too limited to meet the total need for day-care among non-AFDC female eligibles and, rather than offer services to some and not others, no services were provided. New York City had a different experience. Day-care services are provided through the City's Human Resources Administration by contract with the SDA. Despite the fact that many women went without day-care, the full amount of the day-care contract was not used, according to local officials. The difficulty was apparently in the time it took to enroll the children, and the lengthy administrative process. The system for providing day-care was often too unwieldy to meet the needs of a training system that averaged only three months in duration. The Houston, Texas SDA successfully managed this problem. JTPA

participants were offered the opportunity to bring their children to any one of 125 designated day-care providers throughout the City. The providers, in turn billed the SDA directly.

3. The 10 Percent Window of Eligibility

JTPA allows up to 10 percent of participants to have income above the poverty line so long as they have other significant barriers to employment. This allowance has often been mentioned as potentially very useful for serving displaced homemakers, and the Act in fact mentions them as one of the groups likely to be served under this provision. Other groups mentioned under this category are teenage parents, dropouts, ex-offenders, and the handicapped.

Ten of the 25 SDAs in the field sample indicated in their plans that the 10 percent provision was to be used for serving special target groups. Of these ten, seven specifically mentioned either displaced homemakers or teenage parents as target groups.

However, with the exception of Vermont, none of the SDAs reported that much actual use was made of the 10 percent window for special groups. They stated that the 10 percent window was used primarily as a way to prevent adit exceptions for those ineligibiles who occasionally did get into the program.

Once again, there is no way of knowing for certain in

most SDAs actually how the 10 percent window was used, or whether women or specific sub-groups of women benefitted from its use. There was no data compiled, or required reporting, on its usage. What can be stated with certainty is that only rarely was the use of the window implemented with an intent to enroll individuals, male or female, who had specific barriers to employment but were, for whatever reason, above the poverty line.

4. Special Training Programs for Women

Because of the impact of the federal performance standards, multi-component programs that combine different services--for example, remedial education and skills training with an on-the-job placement--have been significantly reduced in favor of single component programs because of their lower cost and simplicity. Multi-component programming is particularly useful for high-need individuals. Given their lower educational levels and labor force attachment, groups such as displaced homemakers and teenage parents often need multiple or sequenced services if they are to be able to take maximum advantage of the training being offered. These services must often be tailored to the particular needs of the individuals or sub-groups being trained.

Only about half of the field sites reported some local programming tailored to the special needs of women or particular sub-groups of women. The programs discussed

below are examples of those designed to meet the special needs of women, or serve particular sub-groups within the female population.

Pre-employment training and job search activities were the most common training strategies used by organizations targeting women generally. These included a pre-employment training and job search program run by a women's organization that focused on non-traditional job placements. Another program run by a local YWCA focused on job search activities for women. It blended funds from state setasides with private resources to offer a high level of support services to accompany job search activities. These services included a clothes bank, day-care services, and emergency financial assistance.

Another SDA funded a women's program which focused on developing high wage, high quality placements usually in the clerical field. The program had a selective enrollment policy limited to female high school graduates 22 years or older. The program had the highest entering wage rate of any program in the SDA.

Thus, there are examples, however rare, of apparently effective JTPA programs designed for women generally or, like the latter, for higher skilled women. If we are to judge by placement rate alone, these programs served women better than standard training programs. However, most special programming for women was aimed at what is

traditionally termed a high need group, AFDC recipients. Seven of the 25 field study SDAs reported that they provided special training programs for AFDC recipients. The programs ranged from basic job club activities to intensive multi-component efforts. A Denver job club program for AFDC recipients was able to negotiate a special positive termination definition for its participants. Under the performance-based contract a limited number of placements into further training or education could be counted as positive terminations.

A more intensive program was run by the State Department of Personnel in Vermont. Targeted on female heads of households, welfare recipients, and the handicapped, the Career Opportunities Program provides limited work experience three days per week and classroom training for the remaining two days. Ongoing counseling was provided. Successful completion automatically led to job placement, usually is a state agency. The program emphasized jobs with career potential, usually clerical in nature. Participation in the program also allowed the state to waive certain civil service exams and other educational and work requirements for these jobs. The program, developed under CETA, had high entrance criteria for participants.

While most of the SDAs with special programs for AFDC recipients dedicated a very small percentage of total II-A

resources to these efforts--under three percent--there were exceptions. Foremost among these was the Cambridge, Massachusetts SDA which used JTPA funds plus support provided by the Department of Public Welfare to provide adult basic education, English as a second language, and literacy training to bring AFDC recipients up to the entrance criteria of the regular training programs. There were few job-ready or nearly job-ready participants to be found in the area as a result of very low local unemployment. Programs with entrance criteria requiring a 7th grade reading level could not recruit enough participants and therefore the SDA looked to pre-JTPA services to develop a pool of qualified participants.

Special programs for teenage parents were very rare among the field sites, and when they existed were very small. In one SDA a program for teenage parents consisted largely of a recruiting effort to identify teenage parents and put them through a clerical training course. The services provided were no different from the regular cycles that used the same facilities. The Cambridge SDA used the concept of pre-JTPA training for teenage parents. Using a variety of funds including JTPA and State education funds as well as a private grant, the SDA provided home tutoring, GED training, and vocational exploration to pregnant and parenting teens.

The enrollment of teenage parents is problemmatic under

JTPA for several reasons. In most cases teenage parents are not WIN-mandatory, that is they have children under the age of six. Therefore their participation in JTPA is entirely voluntary. In addition, the support service needs of teenage parents are particularly high. Infant day-care services are usually very expensive. The high dropout rate among teenage mothers puts many of them in need of remedial education, and, many teenage parents are in need of personal counseling as well as childrearing assistance. Thus, regardless of the need of this population for exposure to work or work skills, they were not an attractive group for JTPA programs to seek out.

Even fewer programs were tailored to the needs of displaced homemakers. One SDA had a caseworker from a state-funded organization serving displaced homemakers outstationed at the SDA. New York City offered one small program for displaced homemakers. There was some interest in encouraging displaced homemakers to become involved in small business development in Contra Costa, California, and two other SDAs expressed interest in developing this concept.

Another sub-group that often overlaps with displaced homemakers, battered women, has also apparently suffered a reduction in services under JTPA. Two SDAs indicated that services provided under CETA for battered women had been eliminated under JTPA. There were no services for battered

women reported at the field sites.

In sum, the special interests of women as reflected in the JTPA legislation were for the most part not a major priority in local JTPA programming, with the major exception of the participation of AFDC recipients, during the initial period of JTPA implementation from October 1983 through June 1985. This lack of emphasis was part of a general pattern that typified JTPA implementation; the primary interest on the part of both SDAs and states was first, in setting up the administrative and management structure of the new JTPA system, and second, in meeting and bettering the federal performance standards, particularly the cost and placement standards. Those interests took precedence over other interests expressed in the legislation, such as serving special groups like women, youth, and dropouts, and in investing the time and resources to develop special programs for those groups.

However, this lack of priority did not significantly impact on the participation levels of women generally. The fact that there are approximately 25 eligible individuals for each training slot in JTPA assures a continuing interest in participating in the program on the part of both men and women. In addition, several models of special programming for women and women sub-groups hold good potential for meeting federal performance standards while also meeting the Act's interest in issues like

non-traditional employment. These models were, however, small and infrequently scattered across the study sites. Without some form of policy pressure or financial incentives, it is not clear that these models will expand enough in either size or frequency to constitute an effective tool in the effort to assist poor women to substantially increase their employability, their career options, and their incomes.

III. OVERSIGHT AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT

In constrast to previous employment and training efforts, the executive branch of the federal government has played almost no role in setting substantive policy or guiding the implementation of JTPA beyond the establishment of the seven performance standards discussed earlier. Though observers may differ on the appropriateness or usefulness of such a modest federal role, and whether or not those who framed the legislation intended quite the degree of federal passivity that resulted, there is no question that one of the major elements of JTPA's organizational structure is the authority and responsibility it confers on state governments. Under CETA, the majority of funds went directly from the federal government to local governments, without state intervention or control. States had control only over Special Governors' Grants and over the rural, small city, and county areas with populations under 100,000--balance-of-state areas that no one unit of local government could reasonably administer. More urbanized areas dealt directly with the federal government under CETA.

Under JTPA, states have a key role with respect to virtually all its provisions and all geographical areas, whether rural, suburban, or urban. The governor is responsible for the Act's primary jurisdictional decisions

including dividing the state into discrete service delivery areas which then organize to plan and carry out the Act's activities. The governor is to prepare an annual statement of JTPA goals and objectives to assist SDAs in their planning. The Act calls for the state to review the Title II-A job training plans developed by each SDA for compliance with the Act, and for institutional, financial, and administrative capacity, before local implementation can proceed. States are authorized to establish fiscal controls and fund accounting procedures necessary to assure proper treatment of federal funds, and to have independent audits of each recipient prepared every two years. States are required to impose reorganization plans on any SDA that does not meet the Act's performance standards for two consecutive years.

The state is to establish criteria for coordinating JTPA with the activities of other state and local agencies that have an interest in employment and training such as education, vocational education, welfare, employment security, and economic development agencies. The state has considerable discretion over the use of the following setasides: six percent of the state's allocation is reserved for incentives and technical assistance, eight percent for educational coordination, and three percent for older workers. Five percent of a state's JTPA allocation is set aside for state administrative costs. The

Wagner-Peyser Amendments included in JTPA set aside 10 percent of its funds for special programs set up by the state.

The foregoing list of state functions portrays a potentially powerful state role in setting up, overseeing, and administering Title II-A. The state role regarding programmatic choices--who will be served under JTPA, and what particular training and other services are offered--is less far-reaching. The Act provides for "local discretion" in the selection of eligible participants, services, and service providers, and it accords the local Private Industry Council and local government the authority to determine the process and organization for carrying out programmatic planning. The Act's basic intent is that programmatic decisions be made locally.[1]

This chapter describes the way the states and local public/private partnerships have carried out their oversight and policy development roles. It makes special reference to their interest in and impact on the employment and training needs of women.

---

[1] This study does not cover activities under Title III of JTPA, Assistance for Dislocated Workers. It should be noted that state authority under Title III extends to programmatic decisions to a greater degree than it does for Title II-A.

A. State Involvement

State activities during the first two years of JTPA tended to focus first on establishing the systems, both administrative and informational, necessary to carry out JTPA's plan and to ensure that the local areas met the provisions of the Act for equitable service. In the main, these efforts were successful.

One area which has proven problematic has been the development of useful management information and reporting systems. The majority of SDAs indicated that while reporting requirements and paperwork have, under state oversight, become more burdensome, access to information has become more difficult. Many states reported that lack of guidance from the federal government--indeed lack of program data collection requirements beyond the seven short-term performance categories--had encouraged a defensive attitude: state offices did not know what information they would ultimately be required to provide in their role as program monitors, so they opted to be inclusive. And often this inclusiveness has resulted in or been accompanied by system errors or glitches that produced little usable information. This area continues to be a major issue for the JTPA system, both in terms of individual state systems, and in terms of the lack of a national reporting system that is both informative and useful. As this report has noted frequently, the lack of

uniform data on very basic issues hindered any in-depth understanding of the impact of the JTPA program on its participants, or the success in addressing those issues that local and state policy makers wanted it to address. Certainly, there was no regularized national reporting system that could produce answers regarding any of the issues related to service to women that the Act itself raises.

Over time, the states have become increasingly involved in substantive policy. The most common state policy interest has been in ensuring the equitable service mandates of the Act. While states have worked to safeguard access to JTPA for most significant segments of the population, the statutory requirement to serve the AFDC population has received the greatest attention.

The state of Massachusetts has been among the leaders in combining JTPA funds with state and federal welfare dollars. Recently, California and New York have also begun major initiatives. The Massachusetts program is more developed at this time. It is also a useful model in that the State has used a number of different strategies including: joint planning with the state welfare agency; a major state-initiated program directed at AFDC recipients; and creation of additional performance standards intended to focus greater attention on long-term impact.

The Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare

dedicated funds directly to JTPA. Incentive funds were given to those SDAs that served three times the proportionate number of AFDC recipients as were in the local population. In addition, $1.6 million in State welfare funds were transferred to the State JTPA office to assure joint planning and to fund programming for AFDC recipients; this is being increased to $4 million for PY 85. For the coming year one quarter of the funds are dedicated to remediation and the remainder are for skills training.

Massachusetts' major programmatic investment has been in a program called Choices, a voluntary system of comprehensive employment and training programs for AFDC recipients. Approximately $30 million in State and federal funds will be spent on the program for the coming year, with more than two-thirds coming from the State.

In addition to the supplementary programs planned for AFDC recipients, Massachusetts has pushed JTPA toward serving most-in-need groups and providing more intensive training programs. Incentive awards under the six percent setaside are weighted toward longer term considerations and give little or no weight to the cost per placement or other short-term standards. The States's concern that intensive training be stressed over short-term job search and direct placement activities is reflected in a requirement the SDAs distinguish between "in-direct" and "direct" placement

rates (respectively, those that are the result of actual skills training and those that result from job search activities). The State is currently experimenting with the use of three new performance standards: average earnings during first three months after placement; job retention and average number of weeks worked during first three months after placement; and welfare reduction.

Massachusetts' level of state involvement and activity was high among the field sites, although there were indications that a number of other states were also taking an increasingly strong stance. California and New York were recent examples; they too were focusing on AFDC recipients.

Other state efforts in shaping JTPA have taken a variety of forms. Below are some of the models or techniques currently being implemented that have a significant impact on service to women.

--Performance Standards. One method used to guide local programming employed by four states in the field sample was to add performance standards to the seven imposed by the federal government. Kansas, for example, made extensive use of this approach, adding a total of five performance standards: increased earnings per dollar spent; enrollment of women; enrollment of minorities; service to female heads of households; and percent of participants placed in new and expanding industries. The details of these standards,

particularly the definition of what constitutes new and expanding industries, were still unresolved at the time of the field visit. Data was also unavailable on the performance of SDAs regarding these standards. While the standards on women and female heads of households have a direct impact on service to women, the increased earnings standard should also have a positive effect on most-in-need target groups within the female population. By establishing a standard based on increased earnings, local programs were given a strong incentive to serve those with little previous experience and low labor force attachment. This standard, therefore, could be used to counteract the effect of the federal standards stressing wage at placement which rewards service to those with greater skills and experience who were more likely to be placed easily and at higher wages.

--Financial Incentives. The Act provides for the use of the six percent setaside as incentive funds. The states determine how much of the setaside to dedicate to incentive awards, and on what basis such funds should be awarded. In many states, the six percent funds are being used for the provision of technical assistance or awarded as incentives for meeting or exceeding the federal performance standards. One-third of the study states, however, have used the incentive funds to encourage policy initiatives focused on hard to serve target groups. Most states that

used the incentive monies to encourage targeting specifically listed sub-groups of the female population--displaced homemakers, teenage parents, and AFDC recipients--as well as other target groups such as older workers and dropouts.

Colorado made extensive use of the six percent funds to achieve policy objectives. One portion of the funds were dedicated to fund pilot projects. These funds were allocated on a formula basis to the PICs, although the state issued Requests for Proposals and retained the authority to select which projects were funded. Most, although not all, of the PICs had their first choice funded. The remainder of the funds were distributed as incentive monies for serving most-in-need target groups. The Governor's Job Training Office, which has oversight responsibility for JTPA, developed a list of target groups including welfare recipients, displaced homemakers, and teenage parents as well as ex-offenders, ex-substance abusers, and others. Each year the state selects two target groups for which incentive funds are available. In addition, each SDA can select two additional target groups. In order to qualify for the incentive awards the SDAs must increase the placement rates over the previous year's performance while continuing to serve the same proportion of members of the target group.

--Supplemental Funds. A number of states appropriated funds to supplement JTPA allocations, or used other existing state funds (e.g., Vocational Education money) to support JTPA activities. While some of these programs were policy neutral, and intended to leverage outside monies without specifying program guidelines, others designated the funds for special target groups. Pennsylvania and Vermont have both appropriated funds for service to hard to serve population groups. The Vermont program will fund pilot programs for a variety of sub-groups. Pennsylvania has appropriated $625,000 to fund programming specifically for pregnant and parenting teens. Although the funding level is low, there is a required match with JTPA funds. The interest of Massachusetts, California, and New York has already been noted.

Other states opted to use other state or federal resources to supplement JTPA funds. For example, Florida has initiated a statewide welfare diversion program. This program is of particular interest because not only is it targeted on AFDC recipients, it also uses on-the-job training for women. The program, known as TRADE, provides counseling and pre-JTPA training for AFDC recipients who are then placed in OJT slots by the SDAs. The state program also provides a $1.00 per hour supplement to the OJT wage.

--Personnel Training. The training of personnel to understand issues relating to women is being implemented in Vermont. Similar training is being planned in several other states. The JTPA office in Massachusetts has applied for welfare funds to undertake a training program and the Michigan State Department of Labor included a similar effort as one of the recommendations in a study on JTPA and women. The Vermont program is the result of a recommendation by a state Commission on the Status of Women, and will provide special training for State Job Service personnel who are responible for providing the majority of services under JTPA.

B. Local Level Involvement

From the state's perspective, JTPA represents an expansion of authority and responsibility. The local perspective is less straightforward. The local JTPA structure is more complex, and its perspectives more diverse. Under CETA, local government had been the primary institution of authority and responsibility except, as noted earlier, in the less populated areas where states had administrative responsibility. Under JTPA, local government is in partnership with the Private Industry Council, or PIC.

The majority of a PIC's membership must be business representatives who are owners, chief executive officers or officers with substantial management or policy positions.

The PIC chair is to be one of the business representatives. In partnership with local government, the PIC is to provide policy guidance, exercise oversight, determine procedures for the development of the job training plan, and select a grant recipient and administrative entity to implement the job training plan. The PIC has authority, although it is often not used, to hire staff, incorporate, and solicit and accept contributions and grant funds.

The areas in which PICs were generally most active in setting policy were contractor selection and public relations, that is in revamping the image of employment and training programs in the private sector. They showed relatively little interest in women's issues. Only one SDA among the 25 field sites reported that the PIC had been active in developing a policy directly relating to service to women. Another SDA reported that, while strictly speaking women's issues were not a PIC priority, service to most-in-need target groups was.

The remaining field sites reported that issues relating to women were not a priority. This is not to say that specific issues were not discussed or that advocates of women's groups did not raise issues, but that in developing policy, the special needs and interests of women were not a focus of primary interest. In part this lack of priority status reflected the overall trend in JTPA away from

targeting issues; it also reflected the fact that women's participation rates in JTPA have been satisfactory at most sites.

It is noteworthy that the three SDAs that reported the strongest interest in targeting local programs had all established special advisory groups. In Seattle (King County), Washington, the Advisory Council represented a variety of target groups, not just women. Contra Costa, California, had an Advisory Board on Women to counsel the PIC on the impact of programming decisions on women. In Vermont the State Commission on the Status of Women reported to the Governor (who also happens to be a woman) and has responsibilities beyond but including the impact of JTPA on women.

State and local officials involved in JTPA oversight and policy development have shown a gradually increasing interest in issues related to employment and training services to women over the first two years of JTPA implementation. This interest is not widely spread over the study sites but, as the examples cited show, when interest has been sparked it has often resulted in a considerable commitment of resources. Interest in AFDC employment has been the issue of greatest interest; teenage parents, displaced homemakers, day-care, non-traditional employment, and other issues have not provoked the same level of interest.

Further interest in and resources committed to employment and training services for women are most likely to be a result of increased state involvement. As the examples cited above indicate, not only has state level interest been the most common avenue for increased programming for women, it is also the only avenue which has the capacity to commit a meaningful level of resources. JTPA allocations at the local level are so vastly reduced from prior CETA levels that without supplements from state JTPA setasides, other state-directed federal monies, or special state legislation, specially targeted efforts toward women will in most cases be too small to have a substantial impact.

IV. CONCLUSION

Almost without exception the SDAs and states involved in this study view JTPA as primarily a "no frills" training program that can place a very high percentage of its participants in jobs quickly and comparatively inexpensively. This emphasis on high placement/low cost performance has generally operated as a disincentive to targeting services on particular groups of clients, particularly those that might require supportive services or a combination of training services. In addition, the severely reduced allocation of federal resources to employment and training services over the past five years has lessened the inclination of program administrators to focus local JTPA programs on specific issues or groups of eligibles. Thus a number of the special issues relating to employment and training services for women specified in the legislation have not received high priority in the implementation of JTPA. Non-traditional employment, use of the 10 percent window of eligibility, dedication of support services to day-care, have all been "backburner" issues at most of the sites while the basic program was being set up. Specially tailored programming for women was limited to a very small percentage of training dollars. Hard to serve target groups such as displaced homemakers and teenage parents were only very rarely offered special services.

Despite the low level of special activity, there were individual efforts that offered interesting strategies for dealing with the special needs of women. These ranged from state-developed performance standards to the model programs of individual service providers, and include one SDA that has made service to women a focus of its entire programming. Moreover, there are indications that states are becoming more active in promoting programming and services for women.

In addition, Title II-A has had reasonably good results in terms of overall female participation. Though actual participation rates have been on average slightly below both local goals and equitable share levels, they have improved over the course of JTPA's implementation, and for the most part local SDAs have exceeded, met, or come reasonably close to their participation goals.

JTPA's performance regarding AFDC enrollment has been even better: 84 percent of the sites met their goals for AFDC enrollment. That welfare reduction was a major goal of the JTPA legislation contributed considerably to this accomplishment; that AFDC recipients had a steady source of income during JTPA training facilitated the accomplishment considerably. State financial and legislative support for AFDC employment and training programs made AFDC programming large, with considerable potential impact, in about a quarter of the field study states.

The success of these major state-initiated AFDC programs, and of the smaller, pilot-type efforts aimed at women or sub-groups like teenage parents and displaced homemakers, will determine to a great degree whether employment and training issues special to women continue to receive increasing resources and consideration by JTPA administrators.

The standards by which JTPA programs are judged will thus help determine the degree to which women's specific interests become a greater priority in JTPA programming. Looking at long-term impact and cost-benefit ratios, or comparing pre- and post-JTPA wage rates, are standards by which women generally, and female subgroups like long-term welfare recipients, fare very well. Previous impact research has consistently found that high-need or most-in-need groups like long-term welfare recipients achieve considerable long-term financial benefits for themselves and for the taxpayer by participating in intensive employment and training programming. Women generally fare well when pre- and post-program wage rates are compared, primarily because their wage levels are generally lower than men's. Thus programs promoting non-traditional employment for women would do particularly well under that standard.

Utilizing only the seven short-term performance standards that are now JTPA's national goals will most

likely inhibit the size and impact of any continuing increase in JTPA's attention to women's issues, in particular non-traditional employment and high-need target groups. Success under the federal standards bears no necessary relationship to long-term effectiveness and in fact is best achieved by enrolling the most job-ready clients possible.

Given that women are a majority of the poor adults in this country, and a majority of the welfare recipients, a continuing increase in JTPA services to women would seem to be a fair and effective use of scarce federal social program resources. The addition of performance standards that highlight long-term cost effectiveness, and the creation of a national reporting system that is more useful to both policy makers and program administrators, are key changes in the present system that would promote that increase. Now that the basic JTPA program is established, with a proven operating record, it may also be that federal, state and local JTPA officials will in the natural course of carrying out their responsibilities be more attentive to those directives and goals of the Act that were not initial priorities.